

**EXHIBIT 4**  
**Redacted Version of**  
**Document Sought to**  
**be Sealed**

## Message

**From:** chrome-leads@google.com [chrome-leads@google.com]  
on behalf of Sean Harvey [sharvey@google.com]  
**Sent:** 2/2/2009 3:47:30 PM  
**To:** Welmer Van Der Wel [wvanderwel@google.com]  
**CC:** Sundar Pichai [sundar@google.com]; Linus Upson [linus@google.com]; Caesar Sengupta [caesars@google.com]; Mike Belshe [mbelshe@google.com]; Ian Fette [ifette@google.com]; Barbara Stanley [bstanley@google.com]; xfp-leads [xfp-leads@google.com]; Joerg Heilig [jh@google.com]; Jonathan Bellack [jbellack@google.com]; chrome-leads [chrome-leads@google.com]; Jim Roskind [jar@google.com]  
**Subject:** [chrome-leads] Re: [xfp-leads] Re: IE8 "inprivate filtering" is not a part of a "porn mode" and may be an attack on Google ads or analytics

totally aware that this is a big problem. still working to get formal messaging out on this.

On Mon, Feb 2, 2009 at 10:42 AM, Welmer Van Der Wel <[wvanderwel@google.com](mailto:wvanderwel@google.com)> wrote:  
It would help greatly if we could get a formal statement from Google. Many DFP clients are asking about this and we keep telling them that we have not had a chance to fully test the impact.

On Sun, Feb 1, 2009 at 9:52 AM, Sundar Pichai <[sundar@google.com](mailto:sundar@google.com)> wrote:  
Thanks, we are following this and responding, pls dont discuss more in this thread. Thanks

On Sun, Feb 1, 2009 at 8:30 AM, Linus Upson <[linus@google.com](mailto:linus@google.com)> wrote:  
[+sundar,chrome-leads]

I believe Sundar is involved in Google's response. It may not be something suitable for email.

Linus

On Sat, Jan 31, 2009 at 8:07 PM, Jim Roskind <[jar@google.com](mailto:jar@google.com)> wrote:  
I have not investigated personally, but I was told by my colleague that this filter feature is separate from the "inprivate mode," which some refer to as a "porn mode." You can read about Inprivate Filtering (formerly Inprivate Blocking) as distinct from Inprivate Browsing (a.k.a., Inprivate Mode a.k.a., porn mode) at:

[http://www.efluxmedia.com/news\\_Internet\\_Explorer\\_8\\_RC1\\_Released\\_33967.html](http://www.efluxmedia.com/news_Internet_Explorer_8_RC1_Released_33967.html)

Quoting from that article: "Along with the InPrivate Filter, another sought-after feature that was first implemented in IE 8 Beta 2 is an updated version of InPrivate Browsing, similar to Google Chrome's Incognito window." That sure makes it sound like these features are distinct.

I was told that in one IE 8 beta the FILTER was on by default, but now it is off by default. I was told that the real problem is that it has become progressively easier to "turn on" the filter. I was told the a pop-up dialog is something kindred to "Would you like IE to protect your privacy and prevent third parties from sharing information about you?".

I strongly suspect that confusion between the mode and the filter is reducing push-back (as per Mike's comment). My subject line was meant to help illuminate the confusion (and I'm hoping I'm not the confused person).

**Rakowski**

**21**

08/19/21

I was also told that parts of MS (where they sell ads) are not as pleased about this feature, but perchance MS is in a better position to deploy the "work-arounds."

On Sat, Jan 31, 2009 at 6:46 PM, Mike Belshe <[mbelshe@google.com](mailto:mbelshe@google.com)> wrote:

This has come up a number of times and does appear to be a significant threat to google, google's partners, and all advertising on the web. I don't know what the official google response is; except that since it is only in the "inprivate" mode, it is less of a threat.

A more adventurous jump would be for Microsoft to simply bundle an adblocker in IE by default. They haven't done that yet, but if I were them, it would be on the radar.

On Sat, Jan 31, 2009 at 3:41 PM, Jim Roskind <[jar@google.com](mailto:jar@google.com)> wrote:

Sorry If Already Known:

A friend of mine at AOL called today to chat with me about the new "inprivate filtering" in IE 8. Apparently it is making his life hard, as it is seemingly targeted at harming providers of advertisements.

To review what he told me (which matches the high level blurbs I found on the net): "Inprivate filtering" adaptively blacklists domains that are found to provide sub-resource content to ten or more separate sites. They purport to do this to prevent these blacklisted sites from tracking user surfing actions. It is interesting that this filtering doesn't actually check to see if cookies etc. are being set. In the extreme, if a company with many subdomains hosts a trademark GIF file on a central domain, that central domain may get blacklisted (even if the content it serves is cachable, and no cookies are set etc.).

My friend told me that when he surfed around with IE 8, after a few hours, a number of Google sites were at the top of the blacklist (with a bunch of AOL sites next on the list).

He also told me that the algorithm was pretty stupid, and probably could be avoided, but it was going to be a hassle (at least for him, at AOL) to change the domains and/or paths in all their deployed ads.

I was wondering if we were actively tracking this (mis)feature, and its potential impact on google served (or tracked) advertisements?

Thanks,

p.s., It is rather interesting that the new adaptive DNS pre-resolution for sub-resources in Chrome tries to accelerate access to these subresources, which are being blocked by IE 8.

--

---

Sundar Pichai  
GoogleInc.

Voice: 650-253-6341

Email: [sundar@google.com](mailto:sundar@google.com)

--

[wvanderwel@google.com](mailto:wvanderwel@google.com)

--

Sean Harvey  
Product Manager  
Google Content Network & Platform Ad Serving  
212-381-5330  
[sharvey@google.com](mailto:sharvey@google.com)

**PRODBEG** [GOOG-BRWN-00225677](#)

**PRODEND** [GOOG-BRWN-00225679](#)

**CUSTODIAN/SOURCE** Brian Rakowski

**DATELASTMOD** 02/02/2009

**DOCTITLE** [chrome-leads] Re: [xfp-leads] Re: IE8 "inprivate filtering" is not a part of a "porn mode" and may be an attack on Google ads or analytics

**SUBJECT** [chrome-leads] Re: [xfp-leads] Re: IE8 "inprivate filtering" is not a part of a "porn mode" and may be an attack on Google ads or analytics

**CONFIDENTIALITY** Confidential

**PRODVOL** PROD023

**REDACTED** N

**MD5 HASH** 

**TEXTPATH** [GOOG-BRWN-00225677](#).txt

**ILS\_ProdVol** PROD023

**ILS\_ProdDate** 06/18/2021

**ILS\_DocDate** 02/02/2009

**AllCustodians** Brian Rakowski

**Owner** sharvey